

Close Binary White Dwarf Systems: Numerous New Detections and Their Interpretation

Rex A. Saffer¹ & Mario Livio

Space Telescope Science Institute², 3700 San Martin Dr., Baltimore, MD 21218

email: *saffer@stsci.edu*, *mlivio@stsci.edu*

Lev R. Yungelson

Institute of Astronomy of the Russian Academy of Sciences,

48 Pyatnitskaya St., Moscow 109017, Russia

email: *lry@inasan.rssi.ru*

Accepted for publication in the Astrophysical Journal

ABSTRACT

We describe radial velocity observations of a large sample of apparently single white dwarfs (WDs), obtained in a long-term effort to discover close, double-degenerate (DD) pairs which might comprise viable Type Ia Supernova (SN Ia) progenitors. We augment the WD sample with a previously observed sample of apparently single subdwarf B (sdB) stars, which are believed to evolve directly to the WD cooling sequence after the cessation of core helium burning. We have identified 18 new radial velocity variables, including five confirmed sdB+WD short-period pairs. Our observations are in general agreement with the predictions of the theory of binary star evolution. We describe a numerical method to evaluate the detection efficiency of the survey and estimate the number of binary systems not detected due to the effects of varying orbital inclination, orbital phase at the epoch of the first observation, and the actual temporal sampling of each object in the sample. Follow-up observations are in progress to solve for the orbital parameters of the candidate velocity variables.

Subject headings: stars: white dwarfs — binaries: close — stars: supernovae

¹Current address: Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, Villanova University, 800 Lancaster Ave., Villanova, PA 19085, email: *saffer@ast.vill.edu*

²Operated by The Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1. Introduction

Both theoretical and observational investigations into the origins of Type Ia Supernovae (SN Ia) have focused on binary star evolution. Within this framework, scenarios are divided into “single degenerate” (Whelan & Iben 1973) and “double degenerate” (Webbink 1984; Iben & Tutukov 1984a) models. In the former models, a white dwarf (WD) accretes from a nondegenerate companion, while in the latter, two WDs with a total mass exceeding the Chandrasekhar limit (M_{ch}) are assumed to coalesce. The latter scenario predicts that there should exist a population of close, short-period ($P \lesssim 10^{\text{h}}$) binary WD systems, or double degenerates (DDs), with total system masses in excess of M_{ch} . The binary components are initially brought to short-period orbits by common envelope (CE) evolution, with the energy necessary to expel the envelope taken from orbital shrinkage (Iben & Livio 1993). Subsequently, further loss of orbital angular momentum through emission of gravitational wave radiation provides the mechanism through which the merger can take place. It is important to note that at present it is not entirely clear if the coalescence of two WDs with a total mass exceeding M_{ch} really produces a SN Ia or rather an accretion induced collapse (cf. Mochkovitch & Livio 1990; Mochkovitch, Gurrerero, & Segretain 1997). However, the existence of DD systems is a definite prediction of the theory of close binary star evolution.

Recently, several authors have made the suggestion that the properties of observed SN Ia are not consistent with the detonation of progenitors having a single, well-defined mass. These include an apparently real dispersion in the peak SN Ia absolute B magnitudes and a correlation between the peak magnitude and the decay rate of the B light curve (Phillips et al. 1992; Hamuy et al. 1996). Pinto & Eastman (1998) report matching the relationship only by requiring a variation in the amount of carbon burned to Ni^{56} of nearly a factor of two. It has been suggested that accumulation of He atop an ordinary sub- M_{ch} CO WD, or the merger of sub- M_{ch} He+CO WDs might provide the necessary range of masses and produce edge-lit detonations (ELDs) with SN Ia characteristics (e.g., Livne & Arnett 1995; Woosley & Weaver 1994; Liebert, Arnett, & Benz 1996). The viability of this mechanism is controversial (see, e.g., Branch et al. 1995; Wheeler 1996), and existing estimates of the expected rate of ELDs in sub- M_{ch} systems fall short of the inferred Galactic SN Ia rate (Tutukov & Yungelson 1996). Another alternative is that some of these systems may evolve into ultra-short period interacting AM CVn systems, which are believed by many authors to consist of lower-mass CO white dwarfs accreting from very low-mass He WD secondaries (e.g., Liebert et al. 1996).

Saffer, Liebert, & Olszewski (1988) discovered the prototype DD, L 870–2 (EG 11), which has an orbital period $P \sim 1^{\text{d}}56$. However, the period is too long for the system to merge on an astrophysically interesting time scale. When the merger does take place, a

SN Ia probably will not result since the total system mass is below M_{ch} (Bergeron et al. 1989). In recent years, three systematic searches for DDs have been performed. Two of these (Robinson & Shafter 1987, hereafter RS; Foss et al. 1991, hereafter FWG) failed to discover any candidates at all. The third (Bragaglia et al. 1990, hereafter BGRD) did discover one DD (and 4 other candidates), but the low primary mass ($M \sim 0.37 M_{\odot}$; Bragaglia et al. 1995) of the confirmed DD renders it an unlikely SN Ia progenitor. We note that BGRD found a period $P \sim 1^{\text{d}}18$ for their confirmed DD (0957–666), however, recent observations (Moran, Marsh, & Bragaglia 1997) reveal that the system actually has a period $P \sim 88$ minutes and primary and secondary masses of 0.37 and 0.32 $M_{\odot}$, respectively. Recently, observations targeting the low-mass tail of the WD mass distribution of Bergeron, Saffer, & Liebert (1992) spectacularly confirmed the prediction that WDs with masses less than the canonical core-helium ignition mass are likely to be post-common envelope objects residing in short-period binary systems (Marsh, Dhillon, & Duck 1995; Marsh 1995). However, the low WD masses again make them unlikely SN Ia progenitors. These negative results have cast some doubt on the merging DD scenario as the favored mechanism for producing SN Ia.

There does exist one example of a DD system where the combined mass is believed to exceed the Chandrasekhar limit. Liebert et al. (1992) discovered that LB 11146 consists of a normal DA WD and a highly magnetic DAXP WD. The combined mass of the system is between 1.7–1.9 $M_{\odot}$, but the orbital period is unknown. Glenn, Liebert, & Schmidt (1994) failed to detect radial velocity variations in the core of H α to a limit $\sim 20 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ with periods ~ 1 hour, and a recent *Hubble Space Telescope* imaging program (Schmidt, Liebert, & Smith 1998) did not resolve the components to a separation $\leq 0''.025$, corresponding to ≤ 1 a.u. on the plane of the sky. If the progenitor stars were massive, as seems likely given the large masses of the remnants, close binary interaction is likely to have occurred in a previous AGB phase. Further work to establish the orbital period of this remarkable binary is urgently needed.

Another possible outcome of close binary evolution is a merger during the late stages of a CE phase leading to the formation of a single, possibly massive white dwarf (e.g., Livio, Pringle, & Saffer 1992; Segretain, Chabrier, & Mochkovich 1997). Large numbers of hot white dwarfs were detected in the ROSAT and EUVE surveys, and analyses of optical follow-up observations (e.g., Marsh et al. 1997; Vennes et al. 1997; Finley, Koester, & Basri 1997) determined stellar parameters, including masses. Comparing the ROSAT and EUVE samples with the cooler, optically selected sample of Bergeron et al. (1992) revealed a statistically significant excess of hot, supermassive WDs, which may represent a population of coalesced binary WDs. The high-mass excess may partly arise from differences in the cooling rates of normal ($\sim 0.6 M_{\odot}$) and massive ($> 1.0 M_{\odot}$) stars, but there may still be too

many massive white dwarfs to be explained by the predictions of single star evolution, with a conventional initial mass–final mass relation, initial mass function, and star formation history.

Recent theoretical work (Yungelson et al. 1994, hereafter YLTS; Iben, Tutukov, & Yungelson 1997, hereafter ITY) reveals that consideration of the "visibility function", a consequence of WD cooling along evolutionary sequences, is an important factor in calculations of the expected DD number distribution. Systems born with orbital periods $P \gtrsim 10^h$ do not evolve to shorter periods by emission of gravitational radiation on interesting (i.e., short) timescales. Below 10^h , an approximate equilibrium is established between systems born into short-period orbits and those that vanish either by merging or by cooling in some 10^8 years beyond the detection limits of surveys with relatively bright limiting magnitudes, such as our own. Only a small fraction of these pairs will actually merge in the 10^8 year period of visibility, and only $\sim 1/20$ of the pairs with $M_{\text{tot}} \gtrsim M_{\text{ch}}$ are visible (cf. ITY, Figure 2). These results indicate that previous DD searches had sample sizes too small to reveal the massive, short-period systems of interest. On the other hand, it is clear that the close DDs that *were* discovered (Saffer et al. 1988; BGRD; Marsh et al. 1995; Marsh 1995) fall within the peak of the expected DD number distribution (cf. YLTS, ITY). YLTS suggested that further searches with increased sample sizes are likely to reveal the existence of the short-period, massive DD population. In this paper, we report observations of an enlarged sample in order to place meaningful constraints both on DDs as SN Ia progenitors and, more generally, on the theory of close binary star evolution.

2. Observations and Radial Velocity Variability

Our sample comprises 107 apparently single DA (hydrogen line) and DB (helium line) WDs with $V \leq 15$ drawn from the catalog of McCook & Sion (1987), which are largely not in common with the previous three systematic surveys. Over two observing seasons, in a total of 21 nights in 4 observing runs from 1994–1996, we have obtained radial velocity spectroscopy at the Kitt Peak National Observatory’s 2.1-m reflector equipped with GOLDCAM. This instrumentation provided $3\text{\AA}$ FWHM spectral resolution over a spectral range of $\sim 700\text{\AA}$ centered on $H\alpha$ and including He I $\lambda 6678$. Exposure times were chosen to achieve a signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio of ~ 30 per pixel.

We have augmented the WD sample with a sample of 46 apparently single subdwarf B (sdB) stars previously observed by Saffer (1991; see also Saffer et al. 1994). The radial velocity observations were obtained using the Steward Observatory’s Kitt Peak Station 2.3-m reflector, equipped with instrumentation similar to that used at the Kitt Peak 2.1-m

and providing nearly identical spectral coverage and resolution. The inclusion of the sdB stars in the sample is appropriate since these core helium-burning stars are believed to evolve directly to the WD cooling sequence on a relatively short time scale following core helium exhaustion. Theoretical calculations which predict the period and mass distributions of DDs do take into account the contribution from the descendents of He stars.

Our choices of spectral features, resolution, and S/N ratio for our observations convey several advantages: 1) In all but the hottest DA WDs, and in all sdB stars, $H\alpha$ has a sharp (FWHM $\sim 1\text{\AA}$) non-LTE core, making it possible at our resolution and S/N ratio to measure radial velocities with 20–30 km s $^{-1}$ errors despite the extreme width of the Stark-broadened absorption line. The He I $\lambda 6678$ line in DB WDs provides similar precision, 30–40 km s $^{-1}$. The close, short-period DDs of interest have peak-to-peak radial velocity amplitudes nearly an order of magnitude larger than these detection limits, and any existing systems would have a significant probability of detection (for our sample, $\sim 70\%$ in the period range $2^h\text{--}20^d$; see §7 for details). 2) Our method detects objects with similar temperatures, like the prototype L 870–2, by revealing variations of both absorption cores in a double-lined spectrum. The technique of differential photometry in the wings of the absorption line does not detect this type of system. 3) Spectroscopic observations in the core of $H\alpha$ offer the maximum velocity resolution for any WD spectral features observable from the ground at intermediate resolution. 4) The large throughput at intermediate spectral resolution makes it possible to observe large, relatively faint samples with modest telescope apertures.

Our targets were observed twice on any given night separated by 1–2 hr, followed by a third observation a day or two later. Radial velocity variations of short-period systems are easily detected simply by comparing spectra by eye, although in follow-up observations to determine the orbital parameters, velocities will be measured formally by line profile fitting. In particular, derived periods and velocity semi-amplitudes will determine mass functions and provide lower bounds on total system masses.

In Table 1, we list all the WDs in our sample. Successive columns give the WD number, name, V magnitude, $(B-V)$ and $(U-B)$ colors when available in the literature (occasionally only Greenstein multichannel or Strömgren colors are available), and references. We also list 7 objects (Note #3) from samples of sdB stars (Saffer 1991; Saffer et al. 1994), which show significant velocity variability. The remaining non-variable sdB stars and their weighted mean velocities and errors are given in Table 2. In Table 3 we list candidate DD systems which show velocity variability identified by visual examination of stacked spectra, the spectroscopic analog of blinking photographic plates. The last column indicates a weight of either 1 or 2, indicating definite or marginal velocity variability, respectively. We identify definite variables as those for which the spectral line cores vary by $\gtrsim 1.5\text{\AA}$, a 2.5σ detection,

on average. Marginal variables did appear to vary, but at a lower level. The references are the same as in Table 1.

In the first 13 panels of Figure 1, we show spectra of our best candidates (weight 1), emphasizing the cores of the $H\alpha$ lines. The sdB velocity variables are excluded from the figure – unfortunately, the spectra could not be recovered from an ancient archive tape. However, variability in the sdB stars was originally measured by formal line profile fitting (see Table 2 for the results). The last two panels at the bottom right in Figure 1 show the detection of narrow, variable $H\alpha$ emission in the cores of the WD absorption lines, betraying otherwise hidden low-mass main sequence (MS) companions in detached, pre-cataclysmic binary (PCB) systems. The $H\alpha$ emission likely results from reprocessing of UV photons from the hotter WD in the cooler stars’ atmospheres (cf. Saffer et al. 1993).

The laboratory wavelength of $H\alpha$ is indicated with a vertical line in each panel. The figure illustrates the ease with which velocity variables may be identified, even in intermediate-dispersion spectra, and despite the highly Stark-broadened $H\alpha$ absorption wings. We have detected a total of 23 definite variables, including 7 sdB+WD pairs and 2 white dwarf plus main sequence (WD+MS) pairs. Of the total, 11 WD+WD pairs, all 7 sdB+WD pairs, and 1 WD+MS pair are new detections, most of which require follow-up observations to solve for the orbital parameters. Some follow-up observations have already been accomplished – the previously detected sdB velocity variables Feige 36 and Ton 245, both pre-white dwarfs, have been shown to be close binary systems with periods of $8^{\text{h}}5$ and $2^{\text{d}}5$, respectively (Saffer et al. 1998, in preparation). In addition, the sdB stars 0101+039, 1432+159, and 2345+318 have recently been shown to have a periods of $16^{\text{h}}1$ (with a possible alias of $13^{\text{h}}7$), $5^{\text{h}}39$, and $5^{\text{h}}78$, respectively (Moran et al. 1998, in preparation). Low-mass MS companions are ruled out by large mass functions and the non-detection of infrared excesses. The companions are thus inferred to be compact, most likely white dwarfs.

3. Objects in Common with Previous Surveys

Approximately 35% of the objects in our survey are in common with previous surveys. However, most of these objects have not been sampled in the period range in which our survey has the greatest sensitivity:

1. The largest area of overlap with previous surveys is with RS (who found no variables), with 26 of the objects listed in Table 1 being in common. However, the RS temporal sampling provided sensitivity to orbital periods between 30^{s} and 3^{h} , while our survey is

most sensitive to orbital periods between 2^{h} and $10\text{--}20^{\text{d}}$. There is thus no substantive overlap between the two samples in their common orbital period ranges. Table 3 shows that we detected 7 of these objects as radial velocity variables, 4 marginally and 3 definitely.

2. There are 12 objects in Table 1 which overlap with FWG, who also found no variables. Their temporal sampling provided sensitivity to orbital periods between $3\text{--}10^{\text{h}}$. Of the 12 FWG objects, 6 are also in common with RS. Of the remaining 6 objects, we have detected 2 as velocity variables, one marginally and one definitely.
3. The overlap with the survey of BGRD, much of which took place in the southern hemisphere, comprises only 10 objects, 4 of which are also in common with RS and FWG. Of the remaining 6 objects, we definitely detect 2 as velocity variables. These two objects were not detected as variables by BGRD.

4. Notes on Individual Objects

0553+053. This object is a strongly magnetic DA WD, whose $\text{H}\alpha$ absorption line is widely split by the Zeeman effect (Schmidt & Smith 1995). We detect possible line profile variations in our spectra which might be indicative of rotational or orbital modulation. The velocity is otherwise very difficult to measure due to the extremely broad and shallow absorption components.

0710+741, *1101+364*, *1317+453*, *1713+332*, *2032+188*. These objects were detected as short-period binaries by Marsh, Dhillon, & Duck (1995) and Marsh (1995), and as such do not represent new detections. Our survey was performed between November 1994 and April 1996, during which time we targeted these objects prior to having knowledge of their duplicity. We detected variability in all but one relatively faint object (*2032+188*; $V = 15.34$), for which our spectra had very poor S/N in the maximum exposure time of 30 minutes. This limit was imposed to avoid smearing spectra of very short-period systems. Our observations of these objects are very useful, in that they indicate that our detection of known variables is very efficient, at least 80% in this case. Also, since they were observed independently they may be retained in the statistical analysis.

0713+584, *1756+827*. These two objects have large blueshifts, $\sim 300 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, and are likely members of the Galactic halo.

0900+554, *0940+068*, *1247+553*, *2204+071*. The first three objects are classified as DA WDs in the catalog of McCook & Sion (1987), but our observations clearly identify them

as sdB or blue horizontal branch (BHB) stars, as seen in the top three spectra in Figure 2. For comparison, in the bottom spectrum we show a normal DA WD. The lower-gravity stars have narrow, sharp $H\alpha$ absorption lines, and He I $\lambda 6678$ is also detected. The strength of the latter feature in 0900+554 and 1247+553 implies that these two objects could be slightly cooler, lower-gravity BHB stars and not sdB stars, as the latter in general tend to have very weak He I $\lambda 6678$ absorption (cf. Saffer et al. 1994). This is certain for 0900+554, for which an existing blue optical spectrum shows Balmer absorption extending to $n \gtrsim 14$. However, all three objects will eventually evolve to low-mass ($\sim 0.5 M_{\odot}$) WDs and rightfully remain included in the sample. The PG coordinates for 0900+554 (RA 09:00:13.4, DEC +55:26:42) were found to be in error – the object’s location is RA 09:00:05, DEC +55:28:50 (1950). 1247+533 is a visual double – the sdB/BHB star is the southeast object. 0940+068 is barely resolved as a visual binary in the telescope guide star camera. It is not identified as composite in the PG survey and appears single on the PG finder plate. The eastern object is an sdB star, the western object a late-type main sequence star. The fourth object, 2204+071, is ambiguously identified in the PG survey, as there are actually two objects marked on the PG finder plate. The southern object is a DA white dwarf analyzed by Bergeron et al. (1992). We serendipitously observed the northern object thinking it to be the DA. Instead, we obtained the fourth spectrum from the top in Figure 2. The object is either a BHB star, in which case the extreme strength of He I $\lambda 6678$ would imply a helium abundance at least 2–3 times solar, or it is a newly-discovered DAB or DBA WD. Observations in the blue part of the optical spectrum will be required to resolve the ambiguity.

1101+364, 1123+189. The PG coordinates for these objects (RA 11:01:35.3, DEC +36:26:20; RA 11:23:46.6, DEC +18:55:18) are in error. The objects are located at RA 11:01:46.3, DEC +36:26:56 and RA 11:23:42, DEC +18:55:50, respectively (1950).

1104+602. This object (EG 75) is mistakenly identified in the PG survey as PG 1100+604. The correct coordinates are RA 11:04:43, DEC +60:14:48 (1950). The spectrum of the object found at the PG coordinates (RA 11:00:43.5, DEC +60:27:41) and agreeing in the telescope guide star camera with the position on the PG finder plate resembles that of a main sequence G star, based on the depth and narrowness of the $H\alpha$ line.

1204+451, 1459+305. These objects are visual binaries. The DA WDs are the western (1204+451) and southern (1459+305) stars.

1422+095. This object is the well-studied pulsating DA GD 165A (Bergeron & McGraw 1990), which has a very low-mass (possibly sub-stellar), distant companion (Zuckerman & Becklin 1992). We detect the WD as a velocity variable (see Table 3). If the cooling age of the older WD secondary could be determined, an improved lower limit could be placed

on the cooling age of the potential brown dwarf companion. Analysis of delays in the WD pulsation arrival times would be another way to study the system’s orbital properties.

1411+219. This object, identified as composite in the PG survey, is a visual double, which in retrospect can be seen to be barely resolved upon close inspection of the PG finder plate. The DB WD is the northern component of the pair and shows weak H α absorption in addition to strong He I λ 6678. The southern component shows late K- or M-type spectral features.

1559+369, 1600+369. These objects are separate entries in the catalog of McCook & Sion (1987), but in fact are the same object. The PG coordinates (RA 16:00:05.2, DEC +36:55:29) are in error. The object is located at RA 15:59:33, DEC +36:56:58 (1950).

1713+332. This high-proper motion star has 1996.3 coordinates RA 17:13:46.7, DEC +33:16:22.

2009+622. This object was known to show an infrared excess and was spectroscopically observed by Schultz, Zuckerman, & Becklin (1996) in an effort to detect H α emission from the inferred low-mass main sequence companion, with ambiguous results. We clearly detect strong, variable H α emission in the core of the DA WD absorption line. In addition, the emission velocity is seen to vary by some 270 km s $^{-1}$, indicative of a very short-period system ($P \lesssim 1$ day).

2126+734. This object was found to have a cool WD companion at a separation of 1''4 by Zuckerman et al. (1997).

5. Summary of Known DD Systems

In Table 4, we present all known DDs in close (short-period) binary systems having measured orbital periods and primary masses, including the 5 recently discovered sdB+WD pairs with confirmed periods. We omit the ultra-short period AM CVn systems, since they are likely not detached DDs, and their primary stars are believed to be currently accreting from He secondaries. In any case, their primary masses cannot be directly measured, and there is a considerable range in the masses implied by the theory of their evolution (e.g., Warner 1995). Successive table columns give the object, its name, the period in days, logarithm of the period, an estimate of the mass of the primary component, total system mass when known, and the source of the data. We now wish to compare the results of the observations with the predictions of theory.

6. Predictions of Binary Evolution Theory

Population synthesis calculations of the binary population of the Galaxy (YLTS; ITY) predict the birthrate and observable number distributions of DD and WD+MS pairs. Here, we present the results of a recent set of calculations, which like ITY and YLTS take into account the effects of observational selection due to white dwarf cooling and the relative brightness of the components, and which also allow for a more complete comparison with observations (see below). We note that in the context of DD evolution, the primary component is taken to be the visible member of the binary, while in fact the secondary (dimmer) component was most often the originally more massive star. Exceptions are Algol-like systems where conservative mass transfer has reversed the original mass ratio.

The observable (younger and brighter) component may be a helium (He) or carbon-oxygen (CO) WD, while the older, dimmer component (usually unobserved) may be a He or CO WD, or a low-mass main sequence star. In systems composed of two close WDs, the theory predicts that 82% of the primaries are He WDs, in good agreement with observations. In fact, Table 4 shows that of all known DDs with confirmed periods and primary masses, every WD except L 870–2 is inferred to be of the He variety based on its low mass ($< 0.5 M_{\odot}$). The five sdB primaries are expected to be He stars which eventually will evolve to lower-mass CO WDs after cessation of core helium-burning.

The goal of this and previous surveys aimed at detecting DD systems, beyond the desire to identify a pre-SN Ia system, is to confront the observations with the mass and period distributions predicted by the theory. Previously, these distributions have been considered independently (cf. Figures 1 and 2 of YLTS; Figure 2 of ITY). Here, we consider the bivariate distribution $N(\log P, \log M)$, which may provide insight into different evolutionary channels that, while producing DD systems with similar periods, might produce systems with significantly different masses.

Using the same population synthesis code as ITY, we have recalculated the numbers of DD and WD+MS pairs on a fine $\log P$ vs. $\log M$ grid. The grid range and spacings are $\log M/M_{\odot}$ from -0.8 to 0.15 in steps of 0.025 , and $\log P$ (in days) from -1.5 to 4.5 in steps of 0.1 . The masses are those of the primary (visible) WD. In Figure 3, we display a halftone plot of the theoretical DD number distribution, with the greyscale spanning values between 0 and 1.25×10^5 . The filled symbols represent all known DDs in Table 3, with circles for WD primaries and diamonds for sdB primaries. Masses for the WD primaries have been taken from the literature. For the sdB stars, a mass of $0.5 M_{\odot}$ has been assumed, based on their location in the temperature–gravity plane (Saffer et al. 1994; Saffer & Liebert 1994).

Remarkable structure is evident in the bivariate distribution which is obscured in the

projected univariate distributions $N(\log P)$ and $N(\log M)$. A strong ridgeline extends from the low-mass, short-period region toward higher masses and longer periods. The structure is understood as the DD “birthline” – at a given mass there is a period threshold beyond which systems do not interact and never evolve through a common envelope phase. The numbers of systems are largest at low mass, where the initial mass function produces the largest numbers of progenitor stars. The “island” at $\log M/M_\odot = -0.2$ represents the WDs with CO cores. We further discuss the comparison between the theory and observations in Section 8.

7. Selection Effects and Detection Efficiency

Our survey method fails to detect all bonafide short-period binaries for several reasons:

1. Random inclination of the orbital planes to the line of sight masks radial velocity variations for near plane-on systems.
2. Our temporal sampling imposes two different constraints: *i*) Exposure times for most objects were between 15 and 30 minutes, which would cause smearing of the observed line profiles for orbital periods shorter than 1–2 hours. This affects all objects in the same way. We adopt a period of 2 hours as a conservative lower limit to our sensitivity bandpass. *ii*) Some orbital periods will have low sensitivity due to period aliasing, affecting objects differently depending on the exact sequence of observation times.
3. In systems with low-mass secondaries, the orbital velocity of the primary will be lower than for high-mass secondaries. WD+MS pairs are especially afflicted with this bias since the MS companion typically must have a mass $\leq 0.3 M_\odot$ in order to have remained hidden until detected spectroscopically. However, this bias is mitigated by the frequent presence of reprocessed $H\alpha$ emission in the MS secondary’s photosphere, which is easily detected.
4. Given our modest radial velocity precision (20–30 km s^{−1} at our intermediate spectral resolution and S/N ratio), very long period systems will have velocities too small to detect variations.
5. In very hot and/or strongly magnetic DA and DAO WDs, the line profiles are usually shallow and very broad, and they lack the sharp, non-LTE absorption core of line profiles of cooler or non-magnetic WDs. Velocity differences are therefore very difficult to discern, except for the very hottest DA or DAO WDs, like Feige 55, which often

show narrow photospheric emission in the $H\alpha$ absorption line (cf. Holberg et al. 1995). Fortunately, few WDs in the sample fall into this category.

Previous investigators (RS, FWG, Marsh et al. 1995, Marsh 1995) have used a number of analytical methods for estimating detection probabilities. Each approach attempted to address a particular statistical question. For example, FWG calculated the probability that no binaries at all were found in their sample, while Marsh et al. (1995) calculated the ratio of the probabilities that individual objects were binaries vs. single stars. Our own concern is to estimate the fraction of bonafide DD systems our survey fails to detect due to selection effects. We choose a Monte Carlo approach, beginning with our calculated mass/period distribution (Figure 3).

For each object in Table 1, we first randomly select an orbital period and primary mass from the theoretical distribution using the rejection method (Press et al. 1986). We deem the experiment to have failed and continue with the next object if the orbital period is less than 2 hours. We then randomly select a secondary mass, using the same procedure, from one of the two distributions for WD+WD given in the top panel of Figure 4 of ITY, according to whether the primary is a He or CO WD. The orbital separation and primary WD velocity are computed, an orbital plane inclination is chosen from the probability distribution $P(i) = \sin i$, and an initial orbital phase is chosen from a uniform deviate. Orbital phase zero is defined as the positive-going crossing of the systemic velocity by the primary’s velocity curve.

With all relevant orbital parameters fixed, radial velocities are then computed for each mid-exposure time of observation, and the maximum radial velocity difference is determined. We consider the simulated system to have been detected if the maximum velocity difference exceeds 65 km s^{-1} , or 2.5 times an assumed 1σ precision of 25 km s^{-1} (consistent with our definition of definite detection when the observed line core variation exceeds $1.5\text{\AA}$). A “hit” is recorded for each detected object, and the next object is then tested.

The experiment was repeated for all WDs in Table 1, and for each complete pass through the sample the detection probability was taken to be the fraction of hits. This is specific to our sample, as it depends on the sequence of observation times for each object, and it assumes a parent population of 100% WD+WD binaries with the theoretical $\log P$ – $\log M$ distribution of Figure 3. The procedure was repeated 1000 times each for two cases of orbital plane inclination: $i = 90^\circ$ (edge-on) and $P(i) = \sin i$, and for three cases of allowed periods: all periods in our calculated grid, P between 2^{h} – 20^{d} , and P between 2^{h} – 10^{d} .

The result for the most favorable condition, with $i = 90^\circ$ and P between 2^h – 10^d , is shown in Figure 4, where the distribution of detection efficiencies is nearly gaussian with a mean of 83% and standard deviation of 3%. The remaining results are given in Table 6, which shows that the effects of random inclination of orbital planes and low velocities associated with longer orbital periods are both important contributors to decreased detection efficiency. We adopt an upper limit of 10–20 days to our sensitivity bandpass (with a lower limit of 2 hours), corresponding to a detection efficiency of $\sim 70\%$ over our entire sample. We do not consider the probability of duplicity for individual objects, as theoretical predictions of the fraction of DDs and the mass and period distributions pertain to the entire population of WDs and sdBs in the Galaxy. Our method of estimating detection efficiencies allows an evaluation of selection effects on the raw observed fraction of DDs detected in the sample as a whole.

8. Comparisons with Theoretical Predictions

Comparison of the existing observations with the bivariate distribution of Figure 3 is not straightforward for two reasons: 1) The number of DD systems discovered to date which have orbital periods and primary (visible) masses determined is still quite small. 2) The measurement errors for the WD and sdB masses, based primarily on surface gravity errors, are generally ~ 0.05 – 0.10 in $\log M/M_\odot$ and do not permit an unambiguous comparison. Of the six systems near $\log M/M_\odot = -0.3$ and lying just below the CO peak at $\log M/M_\odot \sim -0.2$ ($\sim 0.6 M_\odot$) in Figure 3, five have sdB primaries with masses near $0.5 M_\odot$. As such, they sensibly ought to lie slightly below the CO peak, and we do not consider this a serious disagreement. The sdB periods do agree very well with the predicted CO WD period distribution.

Four objects lie comfortably near either the DD birthline or the two peaks at $\log M/M_\odot = -0.5$ and -0.65 . The remaining objects do not appear to lie near peaks in the distribution. The agreement with theory would be improved if the derived WD primary masses were systematically too large, or if the theoretically predicted masses were systematically too small. We note that the effect of varying the common envelope efficiency parameter α_{CE} (which was taken to be unity in our calculations) is largely to shift the predicted periods, not the primary masses (cf. Iben & Livio 1993).

It is possible that at least some observed DD primary masses are overestimated due to the presence of a fainter and usually more massive WD companion. Line profile analysis of the composite optical spectrum of the brighter, lower-gravity visible WD and a dimmer, but higher-gravity WD might result in a derived surface gravity higher than that of the

primary alone and would imply a too-large primary mass. On the other hand, in cases where the mass ratios have been measured (L 870–2, 1101+364, 0957–666), the WDs have similar masses, and it is unlikely that companions contribute more than 20% of the light in 1241–010, 1317+453 and 1713+332 (T. Marsh, private communication). Also, the radial velocity data for 0957–666 almost certainly preclude reducing the WD masses.

There may be another effect which distorts the bivariate number distribution in the $\log P$ – $\log M$ diagram. The theoretical grid was constructed assuming that all WDs follow the same cooling sequence computed by Iben & Tutukov (1984b) for $0.6 M_{\odot}$ WDs. Following their calculations, we assumed that all WDs are detectable for a time $t = \min(10^8 \text{ yr, time to merger})$. In other words, we assumed that the luminosity of the white dwarf decreases below a certain detection limit in 10^8 yr , irrespective of its mass. Until very recently, cooling sequences for low mass WDs were not available. However, recent calculations (Hansen & Phinney 1998) for $M = 0.15$ – $0.45 M_{\odot}$ show that the more massive WDs ($\sim 0.45 M_{\odot}$) cool to the same luminosity several times slower than the lower-mass ones ($\sim 0.15 M_{\odot}$). This may be understood as an effect of the larger surface areas of low-mass WDs. An attempt to quantify the effect of this mass dependence of cooling curves on the number distributions of WDs is currently underway (Tutukov & Yungelson, in preparation). The difference in cooling curves may shift the theoretical distribution in Figure 3 more in favor of high-mass systems, and the strong concentration of WDs along the "birthline" below $\log M/M_{\odot} = -0.6$ may diminish.

In light of the difficulty still associated with interpreting the theoretical bivariate distribution, the total predicted number of DD systems and the projected $\log P$ and $\log M$ distributions remain at present the best means of comparing the theory and observations. In Table 5, we present the predicted fractions of DD and WD+MS systems for three values of α_{CE} . Successive columns give α_{CE} , the number of close DDs vs. all WDs (i.e., the sum of all single WDs plus all wide and close pairs), the number of pre-SN Ia systems vs. all WDs, and the number of close WD+MS pairs vs. all WDs. The pre-SN Ia column describes DDs which have a total system mass greater than M_{ch} and may merge within a Hubble time. The table also illustrates how many WDs have to be surveyed for a detection of a pre-SN Ia, and how much more effort has to be invested before observations will better constrain the theory.

We now compare the predicted numbers of DDs with two observed samples, the one reported here and that of BGRD, as these have similar magnitude limits and are sensitive to the same range of orbital periods ($\sim 2 \text{ hr}$ to a few days). Three comparisons are possible:

1. BGRD found 1 DD and 4 candidate DDs in their sample of 54 WDs ($\sim 1/11$), and 4 WD+MS pairs, 2 which were unresolved, and 2 which were resolved as visual binaries

($\sim 1/13$). In our combined sample of 107 WDs and 46 sdBs we find 6 confirmed DDs and 15 candidate DDs, not all of which are new detections. We note that seven of these have sdB primaries, which have core helium-burning lifetimes of $1\text{--}2 \times 10^8$ years, comparable to the interval during which WDs are the brightest and are most likely to be discovered (cf. ITY). However, the field sdB stars have a birthrate $\sim 0.5\%$ of that of field WDs (Saffer & Liebert 1994), and they are thus quite heavily over-represented in our sample. Considered separately, the fractions of DD systems with WD and sdB primaries among all stars in our sample are $\sim 1/8$ and $1/7$, respectively. Including the visual doubles and PG composites noted in Tables 1 and 2, 12 WD+MS pairs are found in our sample ($\sim 1/13$). Excluding duplication of objects in common, the fractions of DDs and WD+MS pairs found among all WDs in our and BGRD’s combined samples are $1/9$ and $1/12$, respectively. These results are in good agreement with columns 2 and 4 of Table 5 for values of α_{CE} near 1.0 and tend to exclude much lower values of α_{CE} .

2. The population synthesis code also predicts the expected projected period and mass distributions of close DDs. We first compare the observations with the predicted period distribution in Figure 5. The theoretical prediction is the solid histogram (taken as a projection onto the $\log P$ axis from our most recent calculation of the bivariate distribution), and the dot-dashed histogram is the observed period distribution of the DDs in Table 4, including the newly-discovered sdB+WD pairs. The observed distribution (arbitrarily normalized) is generally in agreement with the predicted distribution, albeit possibly offset to shorter periods. Part of the apparent deficit of systems at longer periods is due to the decline in our detection efficiency at orbital periods longer than 10–20 days.
3. In Figure 6, the predicted distribution of primary masses of close DDs is given as the solid histogram. There is a broad peak near $\log M/M_{\odot} \sim -0.5$, corresponding to He WD primaries, and a second strong, narrow peak at $\log M/M_{\odot} \sim -0.2$, corresponding to CO WD primaries, with a tail extending to masses in excess of $1.2 M_{\odot}$. The dot-dashed histogram is the observed mass distribution of the DDs in Table 4. The observed distribution is generally in agreement with the predictions of theory, except for the apparent excess of stars in the bin at $\log M/M_{\odot} = -0.3$. All but one of these (L 870–2) are sdB stars, which as we have previously noted, are over-represented in our sample.

The theory also predicts that some 18% of primary stars in DDs have CO cores. We therefore expect to find 2 CO WDs in the confirmed short-period DD sample; instead, we find none. We note that of the radial velocity variables in Table 3, 10 are in common with the sample of Bergeron et al. (1992), among which only three

objects have derived masses $\geq 0.5 M_{\odot}$: 1232+479 ($0.53 M_{\odot}$, weight 1), 1446+286 ($0.82 M_{\odot}$, weight 2), and 2117+539 ($0.50 M_{\odot}$, weight 1). Four other objects are in common with the sample of Bragaglia et al. (1995), but only one has a derived mass $\geq 0.5 M_{\odot}$: 1422+095 ($0.51 M_{\odot}$; weight 1). It is crucial to obtain accurate masses for the remaining objects in Table 3 to identify any CO primaries which may reside in potential pre-SN Ia systems. The possibility that the primary stars’ optical spectra may be diluted with that of dimmer, possibly higher-gravity companions must be taken into account.

When confirmed, the 18 new candidate DDs (including the sdB variables) from our survey will increase the number of known short-period DDs to 29 systems, approaching the number predicted to include a super- M_{ch} system with a period short enough to merge in a Hubble time ($\sim 1/40$ for $\alpha_{\text{CE}} = 1.0$; see Table 5). Clearly, in addition to the follow-up observations to determine orbital periods and masses of the DD candidates in the current sample, further survey work is required in order to expand the WD sample by approximately a factor of 2 (for α_{CE} of 1.0).

The previous discussions have not taken into account DD systems missed in our survey due to selection effects. We first consider the systems with WD primaries. Assuming an efficiency of 70%, our raw number of 14 confirmed and candidate DD systems would imply the existence of some 20 bonafide DD systems with WD primaries in our sample of 107 WDs, or a fraction just under 1/5 of all WDs. The same result is obtained from the sample of DDs with sdB primaries. Table 5 shows that this substantially exceeds the predicted fraction for $\alpha_{\text{CE}} \sim 1$. Such a high implied fraction of close binaries among all WDs suggests that, formally, $\alpha_{\text{CE}} > 1$ –2. We note that the condition that $\alpha_{\text{CE}} > 1$ has been suggested as a requirement for an explanation of the correlation of orbital periods and eccentricities of high mass binary pulsars (e.g., Portegies Zwart & Yungelson 1998) and millisecond binary pulsars (e.g., Tauris 1996; Tauris & Bailes 1996; van den Heuvel 1994). However, since detailed numerical models of the CE process, which involve energy sources other than gravitational (e.g., Livio 1989) are not available, any treatment of the evolution of orbital separations inside the CE, which ultimately determines the predicted number distributions, is at best an approximate estimate.

9. Binarity Among DAO White Dwarfs

The DAO WDs are a small class of hot, hydrogen-rich stars that show weak, narrow He II $\lambda 4686$ absorption in addition to the broad Balmer lines. Bergeron et al. (1994) analyzed 12 DAOs and found that half of them have such low surface gravities (and by

implication low masses), that unlike most WDs they cannot be products of post-AGB evolution. Bergeron et al. (1994) suggested that the low-mass DAOs might be the product of post-extended horizontal branch (post-EHB) evolution. Another alternative was raised by Holberg et al. (1995), who noted that the very low mass of the DAO Feige 55 ($< 0.4 M_{\odot}$) might be related to its double degenerate nature. The EHB stars (sdBs and the hottest BHB stars) are thought to have core masses very near $0.5 M_{\odot}$, and post-EHB evolution alone is unlikely to have produced Feige 55’s low core mass. In contrast, close binary evolution is predicted to produce a wealth of low-mass remnants, as observations confirm.

Feige 55 was detected as a radial velocity variable in IUE observations, and its orbital parameters were subsequently determined from data including observations obtained during our 1995 March observing run (Holberg et al. 1995). We also observed two other DAO WDs, 1210+533 and 2342+806. The former star has relatively weak $H\alpha$ absorption and has neither a sharp non-LTE absorption core nor a central reversal. It does not appear to be a velocity variable, but we cannot rule it out conclusively. The latter star (GD 561) is a near-twin of Feige 55, with a somewhat hotter temperature and an even lower surface gravity and mass. Our observations do show a distinct emission reversal like that of Feige 55, but the star is constant in velocity at a level $\lesssim 15 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ over a span of 6 nights. These results point out the need for further investigation into the possible connection between close binary evolution and the very low masses of approximately half of all DOA WDs.

10. Conclusions

We have performed a radial velocity survey of a total of 153 field WDs and sdBs, most of which were not previously known to be binary. In the combined sample, we have discovered 18 new DD candidates with WD or sdB primaries, and 1 new confirmed WD+MS pair. Among the 7 sdB variables, we have obtained orbital solutions for the short-period sdB+WD pairs Feige 36 ($P = 8^{\text{h}}5$) and Ton 245 ($P = 2^{\text{d}}5$), and Moran et al. (1998, in preparation) have found orbital periods for 0101+039 ($P = 16^{\text{h}}1$ or $13^{\text{h}}7$), 1432+159 ($P = 5^{\text{h}}39$), and 2345+318 ($P = 5^{\text{h}}78$). Our conclusions are:

1. The population of close, short-period DD systems predicted by the theory of close binary star evolution does in fact exist in significant numbers. The raw observed fractions of confirmed short-period DDs and WD+MS pairs among all WDs are in satisfactory agreement with the predictions of theory for values of the common envelope efficiency parameter α_{CE} near 1.0. However, applying a correction for selection effects implies an excess of existing DDs over the predicted number. A resolution of this apparent discrepancy will have to await a more complete

understanding of the CE process.

2. The observed DD orbital period and primary mass distributions do fall very nearly in the peak of the predicted distributions for $\alpha_{\text{CE}} = 1.0$, although possibly shifted slightly. We note that the discrepancy of the predicted and observed period distributions could be made to vanish by a small decrease in the value of α_{CE} , a free parameter in the theory (“the parameter of ignorance”, I. Iben). The discrepancy with the predicted mass distribution is less amenable to fine-tuning of the theory, and we suggest that some previous primary WD mass determinations may have been systematically biased to higher masses due to dilution of the optical spectra by the presence of unseen, higher-gravity companions. Over-representation of sdB primaries in the combined sample is responsible for the apparent excess of stars with masses near $0.5 M_{\odot}$. A refined analysis of the effect of the mass-dependence of WD cooling sequences upon the $\log P$ – $\log M$ number distribution is also required.
3. The low-mass systems observed by Marsh et al. (1995) and Marsh (1995) tend to have short orbital periods, in agreement with theoretical predictions. However, their total system masses likely are too small to make them viable SN Ia progenitors. Furthermore, the primary stars must have He cores, while CO white dwarfs are thought to be the best candidates to undergo the central ignition and detonation of carbon required to produce a SN Ia.
4. The one known super- M_{ch} DD system, LB 11146, has an unknown orbital period, although its projected orbital separation is $\lesssim 1$ a.u. The large remnant masses suggest that the progenitor stars also were massive, had large radii in the AGB phase, and that the system might have gone through at least one CE phase leading to a short orbital period. However, no “loaded gun” has yet been found, i.e., a super- M_{ch} system with $P \lesssim 10^{\text{h}}$. On the other hand, the sample of confirmed short-period DDs is still smaller than the number predicted to contain a massive, short-period system. When confirmed, the 18 new DD candidates discovered in our survey will increase the number of known short-period DDs among all WDs to a fraction approaching that which theory predicts will include a pre-SN Ia system.

We shall continue with follow-up observations to solve for the orbital parameters of the new WD+WD and sdB+WD candidates found in our survey, and with the survey work itself to further expand the sample. Additional work on the DAO WDs is needed to elucidate the connection between close binary evolution and the very low masses of half of DAOs.

Infrared observations, especially for the higher-luminosity sdB stars, will be required to distinguish main sequence companions having masses as low as $\sim 0.1 M_{\odot}$ from compact companions.

Our survey has revealed a significant new population of close DD systems. Even if no convincing potential SN Ia progenitor is found, the distributions of DD orbital periods and primary masses (and secondary masses and mass ratios, where observable) constitute powerful probes of the CE process, and a meaningful test of the predictions of the theory of close binary evolution now seems within reach.

Acknowledgements: This work has been supported by NASA Grants NAGW-2678, G005.44000, and by the Director’s Discretionary Research Fund at the Space Telescope Science Institute. LRY acknowledges support through RFBR grant 960216351, and is grateful for the hospitality of Meudon Observatory. RAS acknowledges fruitful conversations with Tom Marsh, Jim Liebert, Jay Holberg, and Gary Schmidt. LRY acknowledges day-to-day discussions of stellar evolution with Alexander Tutukov. The authors are grateful for the long-term commitment of the KPNO TAC and awards of valuable Kitt Peak 2.1-m time, crucial to the success of our large-scale survey. We thank the anonymous referee for a critical review of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Bergeron, P., Wesemael, F., Fontaine, G., & Liebert, J. 1989, ApJ, 345, L91
- Bergeron, P., Saffer, R.A., & Liebert, J. 1992, ApJ, 394, 228
- Bergeron, P., Wesemael, F., Beauchamp, A., Wood, M.A., Lamontagne, R., Fontaine, G., & Liebert, James 1994, ApJ, 432, 305
- Bergeron, P. & McGraw, J.T. 1990, ApJ, 352, L45
- Bragaglia, A., Greggio, L., Renzini, A., & D’Odorico, S. 1990, ApJ, 365, L13 (BGRD)
- Bragaglia, A., Renzini, A., & Bergeron, P. 1995, ApJ, 443, 735
- Branch, D., Livio, M., Yungelson, L.R., Boffi, F.R., & Baron, E. 1995, PASP, 107, 1019
- Finley, D.S., Koester, D., & Basri, G 1997, ApJ, 488, 375
- Foss, D., Wade, R.A., & Green, R.F. 1991, ApJ, 374, 281 (FWG)
- Giclas, H.L., Burnham, R. Jr., & Thomas, N.G. 1967, Lowell Obs. Bull. No. 141
- Glenn, J., Liebert, J., & Schmidt, G.D. 1994, PASP, 106, 722
- Hamuy, M., Phillips, M.M., Suntzeff, N.B., Schommer, R.A., Maza, J., Smith, R.C., Lira, P., & Aviles, R 1996, AJ, 112, 2438
- Hansen, B.M.S. & Phinney, E.S. 1998, MNRAS, in press
- Holberg, J.H., Kidder, K.M., & Wesemael, F. 1990 ApJ, 365, L77
- Holberg, J.B., Saffer, R.A., Tweedy, R.W., & Barstow, M.A. 1995, ApJ, 452, L133
- Iben, I. Jr. & Tutukov, A.V. 1984a, ApJS, 54, 335
- Iben, I. Jr. & Tutukov, A.V. 1984b, ApJ, 282, 615
- Iben, I. Jr. & Livio, M. 1993, PASP, 105, 1373
- Iben, I. Jr., Tutukov, A.V., & Yungelson, L.R. 1997, ApJ, 475, 291 (ITY)
- Liebert, J., Bergeron, P., Schmidt, G.D., & Saffer, R.A. 1992, ApJ, 418, 426
- Liebert, J., Arnett, D., & Benz, W. 1996, in *Advances in Stellar Evolution*, eds. R.T. Rood & A. Renzini, (Cambridge University Press), p. 253

- Livio, M. 1989, *Space Science Reviews*, 50, 299
- Livio, M., Pringle, J.E., & Saffer, R.A. 1992, MNRAS, 257, 15P
- Livne, E. & Arnett, D. 1995, ApJ, 452, 62
- Marsh, T.R. 1995, MNRAS, 275, L1
- Marsh, T.R., Dhillon, V.S., & Duck, S.R. 1995, MNRAS, 275, 828
- Marsh, T.R. & Duck, S.R. 1996, MNRAS, 278, 565
- Marsh, M.C., Barstow, M.A., Buckley, D.A., Burleigh, M.R., Holberg, J.B., Koester, D., O'Donoghue, D., Penny, A.J., & Sansom, A.E. 1997, MNRAS, 286, 369
- McCook, G.P & Sion, E.M. 1987, ApJS, 65, 603
- Mochkovitch, R. & Livio, M. 1990, A&A, 236, 378
- Mochkovitch, R., Gurerrero, J., & Segretain, L. 1997, in *Thermonuclear Supernovae*, eds. P. Ruiz-Lapuente, R. Canal, & J. Isern, (Dordrecht:Kluwer), 187
- Moran, C.K.J., Marsh, T.R., & Bragaglia, A. 1997, MNRAS, 288, 538
- Phillips, M.M., Wells, L.A., Suntzeff, N.B., Hamuy, M., Leibundgut, G., Kirshner, R.P., & Foltz, C.B. 1992, AJ, 103, 1632
- Pinto, P.A. & Eastman, R.G. 1998, ApJ, submitted
- Portegies Zwart, S.F. & Yungelson, L.R. 1998, A&A, in press
- Press, W.H, Teukolsky, S.A., Vetterling, W.T, & Flannery, B.P. 1986, in *Numerical Recipes*, Cambridge University Press, p. 281
- Robinson, E.L. & Shafter, A.W. 1987, ApJ, 322, 296 (RS)
- Saffer, R.A., Liebert, J., & Olszewski, E.W. 1988, ApJ, 334, 947
- Saffer, R.A. 1991, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona
- Saffer, R.A., Wade, R.A., Liebert, J., Green, R.F., Sion, E.M., Bechtold, J., Foss, D., & Kidder, K. 1993, AJ, 105, 1945
- Saffer, R.A., Bergeron, P., Koester, D., & Liebert, J. 1994, ApJ, 432, 351

- Saffer, R.A. & Liebert, J. 1994, in the Proceedings of the 9th European Workshop on White Dwarfs, eds. D. Koester & K. Werner, (Berlin:Springer), p. 221
- Schmidt, G.D. & Smith, P.S. 1995, ApJ, 448, 305
- Schmidt, G.D., Liebert, J., & Smith, P.S. 1998, AJ, submitted
- Schultz, G., Zuckerman, B., & Becklin, E.E. 1996, ApJ, 460, 402
- Segretain, L., Chabrier G., Mochkovich, R., 1997, ApJ, 481, 355
- Tauris, T.M. 1996, A&A, 315, 453
- Tauris, T.M. & Bailes, M. 1996, A&A, 315, 432
- Tutukov, A.V. & Yungelson, L.R. 1996, MNRAS, 280, 1035
- van den Heuvel, E.P.J. 1994, A&A, 291, L39
- Vennes, S., Thejll, P.A., Galvan, R.G., & Dupuis, J. 1997, ApJ, 480, 714
- Warner, B. 1995, ApSS, 225, 249
- Webbink, R.F. 1984, ApJ, 277, 355
- Wheeler, J.C. 1996, in *Evolutionary Processes in Binary Stars*, eds. R.A.M.J. Wijers, M.B. Davies, & C.A. Tout (Dordrecht:Kluwer), p. 307
- Whelan, J. & Iben, I. Jr. 1973, ApJ, 186, 1007
- Woosley, S.E. & Weaver, T.A. 1994, ApJ, 423, 371
- Yungelson, R.L., Livio, M., Tutukov, A.V., & Saffer, R.A. 1994, ApJ, 420, 336 (YLTS)
- Zuckerman, B. & Becklin, E.E. 1992, ApJ, 386, 260
- Zuckerman, B., Becklin, E.E., Macintosh, B.A., & Bida, T. 1997, AJ, 113, 764

Fig. 1.— Radial velocity variability at $H\alpha$. The first 13 panels show spectra of WD radial velocity variables. The laboratory wavelength of $H\alpha$ is marked with the vertical line. The sdB variables of Saffer (1991) are excluded. The two panels at bottom right show narrow, strongly variable $H\alpha$ emission in the cores of WD+MS pairs.

Fig. 2.— Narrow, sharp $H\alpha$ and He I $\lambda 6678$ absorption identify the first 3 spectra as belonging to likely BHB stars (0900+554 and 1247+553) or sdB stars (0940+068). The fourth spectrum shows a probable new DAB or DBA star (see the text for a resolution of ambiguity of the PG identifier). The bottom spectrum shows the highly Stark-broadened profile of a normal DA WD for comparison.

Fig. 3.— The predicted observable number distribution of DD systems as a function of mass and orbital period. The masses are those of the primary (visible) star. The greyscale spans values between 0 and 1.25×10^5 . The strong ridgeline extending up and to the right is the DD “birthline”, below which binary systems never interact and experience a common envelope phase. DD systems with known orbital periods and primary masses are plotted with their mass errors. The filled circles and diamonds denote WD and sdB primaries, respectively.

Fig. 4.— Distribution of detection probabilities for the WD sample computed from 1000 trials, assuming the most favorable condition. The orbital plane is fixed at an inclination $i = 90^\circ$, and orbital periods are restricted to the range 2^h – 10^d . The distribution is centered on a detection efficiency of 83% with a standard deviation of 3%. The integral under the curve is unity. See the text for details.

Fig. 5.— Comparison of the predicted and observed projected DD period distributions. The heavy dot-dashed histogram is the observed distribution, arbitrarily normalized.

Fig. 6.— Comparison of the predicted and observed projected DD mass distributions. The heavy dot-dashed histogram is the observed distribution, arbitrarily normalized.

Table 1. White Dwarf Sample

WD	Name	V	$B-V$	$U-B$	Reference
0002+729	GD 408	14.35	−0.08	−0.91	1,13
0004+330	GD 2	13.82	−0.29	−1.21	1,2
0101+039	Feige 11	12.06	−0.24	−0.98	3
0101+048	G 1−45	13.96	+0.31	−0.57	
0112+142	PG	15.0:	−0.59	−0.47	3,4
0134+833	GD 419	13.08	−0.64	−0.06	4
0148+467	GD 279	12.44	+0.06	−0.63	1,2
0151+017	G 73−4	15.00	+0.16	−0.59	
0205+250	G 35−29	13.22	−0.04	−0.85	2
0208+396	G 74−7	14.50	+0.30	−0.47	
0232+525	G 174−5	13.75	−0.55	+0.08	4
0401+250	G 8−8	13.81	+0.11	−0.58	1
0425+168	LP 415−415	14.02	−0.09	−0.97	
0437+138	LP 475−242	14.86	−0.43	−0.25	4,13
0439+466	LSV +46 21	12.67	−0.30	−1.24	5
0453+418	GD 64	13.77	+0.23	−0.61	1
0532+414	GD 69	14.75	+0.32	−0.54	
0549+158	GD 71	13.06	−0.25	−1.16	1
0553+053	G 99−47	14.08	+0.61	−0.11	6
0612+177	G 104−27	13.40	−0.15	−0.98	1,2,7,8
0637+478	GD 77	14.80	+0.13	−0.64	6
0644+376	G 87−7	12.10	−0.08	−0.92	1,2
0651−020	GD 80	14.82	−0.21	−1.19	7
0706+295	KUV	15.45	+0.09	−0.66	
0710+741	GD 448	14.97	−0.06	−0.75	9
0713+584	GD 294	12.04	+0.00	+1.57	1,10
0743+442	GD 89	14.92	+0.07	−0.73	
0834+501	PG	15.82	−0.36	−1.20	5
0839+232	PG	14.42	−0.14	−0.98	1
0854+404	GD 98	14.87	−0.13	−0.94	
0900+554	PG	13.84	−0.05	+0.49	1,10,11
0938+550	PG	14.77	−0.52	+0.05	4
0939+262	Ton 21	14.53	−0.35	−1.16	
0940+068	PG	13.70	−0.19	−1.03	7,11,20
0943+441	G 116−52	13.32	+0.07	−0.54	1
0945+246	LB 11146	14.32	−0.47	−0.19	4,6
1005+642	GD 462	14.03			12
1011+570	GD 303	14.57	−0.49	−0.32	4,13
1012+007	PG	14.90	−0.12	−0.30	3,10
1019+637	G 235−67	14.71	+0.36	−0.49	

Table 1—Continued

WD	Name	V	$B-V$	$U-B$	Reference
1022+050	LP 550–52	14.18	+0.19	–0.51	7
1026+023	LP 550–292	14.20	–0.41	+0.42	4
1057+719	PG	14.95	...	...	12
1101+249	Feige 36	12.70	–0.23	–0.89	3
1101+364	Ton 1323	14.44	–0.46	+0.40	4,14
1104+602	G 197–4	13.80	–0.02	–0.81	1
1121+216	G 120–45	14.24	+0.31	–0.52	
1123+189	PG	14.01	–0.41	–0.59	4,15
1126+384	GD 310	14.89	–0.12	–1.01	
1129+156	PG	14.04	–0.52	+0.11	4
1204+451	PG	14.84	...	...	12,20
1210+533	PG	14.07	–0.70	–0.73	4,5,22
1229–013	PG	14.24	–0.35	+0.05	4
1232+479	GD 148	14.52	+0.06	–0.68	1
1247+553	GD 319	12.31	+0.03	–0.93	11,20
1257+048	GD 267	15.05	–0.09	–0.88	
1310+583	PG	13.89	...	...	12
1317+453	G 177–31	14.13	+0.03	–0.56	1,16
1319+466	G 177–34	14.55	+0.00	–0.66	
1408+323	GD 163	14.06	+0.03	–0.81	1
1411+219	PG	14.38	–0.36	–0.21	4,13?,15,20
1422+095	GD 165	14.32	+0.14	–0.59	7
1432+159	PG	13.90	–0.12	+0.12	3,10
1446+286	Ton 214	14.54	–0.09	+0.01	10
1459+305	PG	13.98	+0.30	–0.84	20
1537+652	GD 348	14.64	+0.18	–0.49	
1538+269	Ton 245	13.89	–0.24	–0.90	11
1559+369	G 180–23	14.36	+0.17	–0.56	
1601+581	PG	14.30	...	...	12
1615–154	G 153–41	13.41	–0.22	–1.08	2
1630+618	GD 354	15.5	CC–1		11
1632+177	PG	13.08	–0.13	+0.47	4
1633+433	G 180–63	14.82	+0.42	–0.42	
1637+335	G 180–65	14.65	+0.18	–0.57	
1647+591	G 226–29	12.24	+0.16	–0.62	2
1713+332	GD 360	14.46	–0.11	–0.90	1,16
1713+695	G 258–3	13.27	+0.07	–0.70	1
1716+426	PG	13.85	–0.66	–0.35	3,4
1756+827	G 259–21	14.30	+0.35	–0.52	
1822+410	GD 378	14.39	–0.19	–0.96	1,13?,19?

Table 1—Continued

WD	Name	V	$B-V$	$U-B$	Reference
1824+040	G 21–15	13.90	+0.05	–0.55	1,7
1826–045	G 21–16	14.54	+0.24	–0.56	
1840+042	GD 215	14.73	+0.25	–0.62	
1845+019	KPD	12.96	–0.23	–1.09	7
1919+145	GD 219	13.01	+0.06	–0.66	1
1935+276	G 185–32	12.97	+0.17	–0.56	
1936+327	GD 222	13.58	–0.12	–0.88	
1943+163	G 142–50	14.08	–0.06	–0.86	
1953–011	G 92–40	13.71	+0.30	–0.61	7
2009+622	GD 543	15.15	–0.69	–0.29	4,17
2028+390	GD 391	13.37	–0.15	–0.98	
2032+188	GD 231	15.34	–0.04	–0.80	16
2032+248	Wolf 1346	11.54	–0.07	–0.87	1,2
2047+372	G 210–36	12.93	+0.14	–0.66	
2111+498	GD 394	13.09	–0.24	–1.15	
2117+539	G 231–40	12.33	+0.07	–0.67	2
2124+550	G 231–43	14.66	+0.15	–0.68	
2126+734	G 261–43	12.88	+0.01	–0.66	2,18
2134+218	GD 234	14.45	–0.04	–0.83	
2136+828	G 261–45	13.02	–0.02	–0.72	1
2149+021	G 93–48	12.77	+0.00	–0.78	1,2,7
2150+338	GD 398	15.11	–0.03	+0.25	10
2204+071	PG	14.74	–0.05	–0.30	19
2207+142	G 18–34	15.61	+0.32	–0.58	
2246+223	G 67–23	14.31	+0.21	–0.67	
2307+636	G 241–46	14.16	–0.70	–0.09	4
2309+105	GD 246	13.11	–0.32	–1.23	1,2,7
2319+691	GD 559	14.75	–0.07	+0.23	10
2326+049	G 29–38	13.10	+0.20	–0.65	2
2328+108	PG, KUV	15.53	–0.03	–0.90	
2329+407	G 171–2	13.82	+0.03	–0.72	1
2341+322	G 130–5	12.92	+0.14	–0.61	1
2342+806	GD 561	14.53	–0.25	–1.21	5,22
2345+318	PG	14.18	–0.05	+0.01	3,10

References. — 1) Robinson & Shafter 1987 2) Foss et al. 1991 3) Saffer 1991; Saffer et al. 1994 4) Greenstein multichannel v , $g-r$, $u-v$ 5) $H\alpha$ emission 6) magnetic – Schmidt & Smith 1995 7) Bragaglia et al. 1990 8) Holberg, Kidder, & Wesemael 1990 9) Marsh & Duck 1996 10) Strömgren y , $b-y$, $u-b$ 11) sdB – narrow He I $\lambda 4471$ 12) PG B 13) DBA 14) Marsh et al. 1995 15) PG COMP 16) Marsh 1995 17) Schultz, Zuckerman, & Becklin 1996 18) Zuckerman et al. 1997 19) DAB 20) Visual double 21) Photographic magnitude and color class – Giclas, Burnham, & Thomas 1967 22) DAO

Table 2. Hot Subdwarf (sdB) Sample

WD	Name	V_{rad}	σ	Remark
0154+204		+13.0	30.9	
0154+182		+86.5	25.8	
0212+230		−78.2	15.4	
0250+189		+4.4	11.4	
0322+114		+28.5	9.3	
0342+026		+12.6	7.0	
0349+094		+30.4	10.8	
0749+658		−27.3	6.9	
0806+516		+5.6	14.4	
0816+313	Ton 313	−52.7	14.9	
0823+465		+23.7	9.9	
0839+399	K345−30	−9.3	13.2	visual double
0856+121		+97.0	10.2	
0918+029		+79.4	16.3	
0919+272	Ton 13	−33.2	16.9	
1114+072	Feige 38	+3.6	8.3	
1154−070		−4.7	13.2	
1223+058		+131.4	21.5	
1224+671		−41.1	7.0	
1230+052		−57.1	12.6	
1233+426	Feige 65	+61.2	13.4	
1303−114		−3.2	13.5	
1323−085		−53.2	7.8	
1325+101		+11.5	22.3	
1343−101		+48.9	17.4	
1442+342		−19.0	5.2	
1623+386	KUV	−90.9	41.7	visual double
1643+209		+52.3	12.8	
1704+221		−62.1	9.2	
1708+409		−197.4	13.1	
2059+013		−7.6	14.3	
2110+127		+6.8	5.2	PG COMP
2128+096		+23.0	19.4	
2135+044		−39.0	7.3	
2204+034		−10.1	13.7	
2214+183		−17.6	8.1	
2229+099		−19.3	9.9	
2301+259		−130.5	9.4	
2356+166		−7.4	8.1	

Table 3. White Dwarf & sdB Radial Velocity Variables

WD	Name	Reference	Weight
0101+039	Feige 11	3	1
0112+142	PG	3,4	1
0401+250	G 8–8	1	2
0549+158	GD 71	1	2
0710+741	GD 448	9	1
0834+501	PG	5	2
0839+232	PG	1	2
0940+068	PG	7,11,20	1
1011+570	GD 303	4,13	2
1012+007	PG	3,10	2
1019+637	G 235–67		2
1022+050	LP 550–52	7	1
1101+364	Ton 1323	4,14	1
1101+249	Feige 36	3	1
1129+156	PG	4	2
1204+451	PG	12,20	1
1229–013	PG	4	2
1232+479	GD 148	1	1
1247+553	GD 319	11,20	1
1310+583	PG	12	1
1317+453	G 177–31	1,16	1
1422+095	GD 165	7	1
1432+159	PG	3,10	1
1446+286	Ton 214	10	2
1538+269	Ton 245	11	1
1647+591	G 226–29	2	1
1713+332	GD 360	1,16	1
1716+426	PG	3,4	1
1824+040	G 21–15	1,7	1
2009+622	GD 543	4,17	1
2117+539	G 231–40	2	1
2207+142	G 18–34		1
2345+318	PG	3,10	1

Table 4. Derived parameters of known close DDs.

Object	Name	$P(\text{d})$	$\log P(\text{d})$	M_1	M_{tot}	Reference
0101+039	Feige 11	0.67	−0.173	0.50		1
		0.57	−0.243			alias?
0135−052	L 870−2	1.56	+0.193	0.47	0.99	2
0957−666	L 101−26	0.06	−1.234	0.37	0.69	3,4
1101+249	Feige 36	0.35	−0.456	0.50		5
1101+364	Ton 1323	0.15	−0.824	0.31	0.58	6
1202+608	Feige 55	1.49	+0.173	0.40		7
1241−010		3.35	+0.525	0.31		8
1317+453		4.80	+0.681	0.33		8
1432+159	PG	0.23	−0.649	0.50		1
1538+269	Ton 245	2.50	+0.389	0.50		5
1713+332		1.12	+0.049	0.35		8
2331+290		0.17	−0.770	0.39		8
2345+318	PG	0.24	−0.618	0.50		1

References. — 1) Saffer 1991; Saffer et al. 1994; Moran et al. 1998, in preparation 2) Saffer et al. 1988 3) Bragaglia et al. 1995 4) Moran et al. 1997 5) Saffer et al. 1998, in preparation 6) Marsh 1995 7) Holberg et al. 1995 8) Marsh et al. 1995

Table 5. Predicted Fractions of DDs and WD+MS Pairs

α_{CE}	Close DD/Total	pre-SN Ia/Total	Close WD+MS/Total
0.5	1/13	1/570	1/16
1.0	1/9	1/340	1/13
2.0	1/7	1/214	1/11

Table 6. Detection Efficiencies (%)

	$i = 90^\circ$	$P(i) = \sin i$
All P	70 ± 4	64 ± 6
$P \in [2^{\text{h}}, 20^{\text{d}}]$	79 ± 4	69 ± 5
$P \in [2^{\text{h}}, 10^{\text{d}}]$	83 ± 3	74 ± 5











